UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,423	02/28/2002	Mike Velten	021944-048US	3204

26720   7590   11/26/2010
LOCKE LORD BISSELL & LIDDELL LLP
600 TRAVIS STREET SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77002-3095

EXAMINER
CHRISTENSEN, SCOTT B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2444	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/26/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

hoip@lockelord.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 August 2010_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11,13-16 and 21-37_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-11,13-16 and 21-37_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in regards to the most recent papers filed on 8/18/2010.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 8/18/2010 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

3.   First, on pages 10-11 of Applicant's remarks, Applicant argues that Bishop does

not provide for the configuring of a subordinate program.

First, it is noted that the instant claim does not provide for what constitutes a

"subordinate program," or what the program is subordinate to. Using the broadest

reasonable interpretation, a subordinate program would be a program subordinate to

another entity, whether it is a computer, another program, etc. Thus, utilizing the

broadest reasonable interpretation, any program could be considered to be subordinate.

Applicant should amend the instant claim to clearly recite what the program is

subordinate to.

As it stands, as in the rejection the monitoring component of Bishop is not relied

on for the subordinate program. Rather, the deployed new software is, where the

configuration that is performed is part of the deployment of the software to the

computer. Further, as in the rejection, Bishop discloses that the monitoring program

can be utilized to perform different functions (Bishop: Column 9, lines 19-25).

Second, it is noted that Applicant argues that the instant claim does not explicitly

state that the configuring is done by the monitoring program, which appears to be the

interpretation utilized by Applicant, rather the configuring is merely done "with the

monitoring program." This yields one of two interpretations, either the configuring is

done by the monitoring program, or the subordinate program is configured to work with

the monitoring program.

Thus, Applicant should amend the instant claim to clearly recite the relationship

between the subordinate program and the monitoring program, and providefor the

specific functionality of the subordinate program.

4.   On pages 11-13, Applicant argues that the alerts of Bishop and Facchetti are

sent to all slaves, as all slaves are equally affected, meaning that there is not

determination made as to which target computer is affected.

However, none of the instant claims makes any requirement that only some of

the target computers are affected and others are not. Thus, even if all computers are

determined to be affected each time, the invention, in as much detail as is claimed, is

still taught. Applicant should amend the instant claims to clearly reflect that one or more

computers are determined to be affected and one or more computers are determined to

not be affected.

5.   On pages 13-14, Applicant argues that the Office overlooked that the claim

requires the uninterruptible power supply to also be on the network coupling the

uninterruptible power supply, the monitoring computer, and the target computer, as in

claim 21. However, the rejection asserts that Facchetti teaches a monitoring program

adapted to receive a network message including data from the UPS (Page 4 - Running

apcupsd - Para. 4). Thus, the UPS is coupled to the monitoring program. Further, a

person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that in a situation where a computer

with a serial connection to a resource where the resource is shared over the network,

the shared resource can be said to be part of the same network, as is the case of

Facchetti. If applicant intends for specific connections to exist (e.g. direct ethernet

connections existing between the UPS and other components on the network),

Applicant should amend the instant claim to reflect this.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-16, 21-22 and 25-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Bishop et al. (US 6,904,458), hereinafter referred to as Bishop,

in view of *Monitoring Your UPS With apcupsd*, hereinafter referred to as Facchetti.

8.   As per claim 1, Bishop discloses running an apparatus monitoring program on a

monitoring computer on the network (Col. 9 lines 14-25);

        configuring a subordinate program with the monitoring program (Col. 9 lines 14-

50 – note that application(s) to be installed to the client are subordinate to the

monitoring software of the computing component in that the computing component has

complete access and control over the application(s) to be installed at the client both at time of installation and at run-time);

installing the configured subordinate program from the monitoring computer to a target computer on the network (Col. 9 lines 26-50);

transmitting a subordinate program instruction from the monitoring computer across the network to the target computer (Col. 9 lines 51-65); and

changing an operational characteristic of the target computer based on the subordinate program instruction (Col. 8 lines 1-15, Col. 9 lines 51-65). However, the prior art of Bishop fails to explicitly disclose wherein the operational status of the supporting apparatus is monitored with the monitoring program and generating from the monitoring program a subordinate program instruction based on the operational status of the supporting apparatus.

Facchetti teaches wherein the operational status of the supporting apparatus is monitored with the monitoring program and generating from the monitoring program a subordinate program instruction based on the operational status of the supporting apparatus (Page 3 Para. 1-2 – see apcupsd UPS monitoring, Page 4 – Running apcupsd - Para. 4-7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of monitoring a supporting apparatus with the prior art of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of monitoring the status of a UPS device, and permitting a shut-down process if the monitoring program determines that the UPS has presented an alarm to the monitoring program (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 4-7).

9.   As per claim 2, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as claimed

above. However, the prior art of Bishop fails to explicitly disclose the monitoring

computer receiving a message from the (supporting) apparatus.

        Facchetti teaches the monitoring computer receiving a message from the

supporting apparatus (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 4-7). It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the use of a monitoring computer receiving a message from a supporting

apparatus with the prior art of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done

so for the purpose of monitoring the status of a UPS device, and permitting a shut-down

process if the monitoring program determines that the UPS has presented an alarm to

the monitoring program (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 4-7).

10.   As per claim 3, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as claimed

above. Bishop additionally discloses the monitoring program detecting whether a

shutdown condition exists (Col. 8 lines 1-17, Col. 9 lines 51-65).

11.   As per claim 4, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as claimed

above. Bishop additionally discloses wherein the subordinate program instruction is a

shutdown instruction if the shutdown condition exists (Col. 8 lines 1-17, Col. 9 lines 51-

65).

12.   As per claim 5, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as claimed

above. Bishop additionally discloses shutting down the target computer with the

subordinate program based on the received shutdown instruction (Col. 8 lines 1-17, Col.

9 lines 51-65).

13.   As per claim 6, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as claimed

above. Bishop additionally discloses wherein installing the subordinate program from

the monitoring computer to the target computer by pushing the subordinate program to

the target computer via the network (Col. 9 lines 26-51).

14.   As per claim 9, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as claimed

above. Bishop additionally discloses wherein installing the subordinate program from

the monitoring computer to the target computer by downloading the subordinate

program from the monitoring computer to the target computer via the network (Col. 9

lines 25-61).

15.   As per claims 10 and 14, Bishop discloses a system comprising:

        a subordinate program configured by the monitoring program and adapted to be

installed on the target computer by the monitoring program, the subordinate program

adapted to receive a predetermined instruction and performing a shutdown routine of an

affected target computer (Col. 8 lines 1-17, Col. 9 lines 14-50). However, the prior art of

Bishop fails to explicitly disclose the claimed first through third routines associated with the monitoring program.

Facchetti teaches a monitoring computer having a monitoring program and adapted to receive data from the apparatus, the monitoring program comprising:

a first routine determining an alarm condition of the apparatus from the data (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 4), a second routine determining a target computer on the network effected by the alarm condition of the apparatus (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 5-7, Page 5 – Networked Configuration – Para. 1-2, Listing 3-4), and a third routine sending a predetermined shutdown instruction to the affected target computer over the network (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 6-7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of detecting an alarm condition, a target computer affected by the alarm condition, and sending a predetermined instruction to the affected target computer over the network with the prior art of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of allowing remote master control of computers connected to a UPS, wherein the network master sends the UPS' alerts to the slave allowing a master to send a shut down command to affected computer to ensure data and hardware safety (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 6).

16.   As per claims 11 and 16, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, Bishop fails to explicitly disclose wherein the apparatus is a UPS. Facchetti teaches wherein the apparatus is a UPS (Page 3 Para. 1, Page 4 –

Running apcupsd – Para. 4). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of monitoring an

attached UPS device with the prior art of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art would

have done so for the purpose of providing remote UPS monitoring and in the event of

an alarm, providing means for shutting down affected computers which are supported

by the same UPS (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 4, 6).

17.   As per claims 13 and 15, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially

as claimed above. Bishop additionally discloses wherein installing the subordinate

program from the monitoring computer to the target computer comprises downloading

the subordinate program from the monitoring computer to the target computer via the

network (Col. 9 lines 25-61).

18.   As per claim 21, Bishop discloses a system comprising:

        a monitoring computer and a target computer (Figure 1, Col. 9 lines 26-50);

        a network coupling the monitoring computer and the target computer (Figure 1);

        a monitoring computer adapted to configure a subordinate program to be

installed over the network on a target computer by the monitoring program and install

the subordinate program on the target computer over the network (Col. 9 lines 26-50);

        the target computer comprising an installed subordinate program and adapted to

receive a network message including a shutdown instruction and shut down the target

computer based on the received shutdown instruction (Col. 8 lines 1-17, Col. 9 lines 14-

50). However, the prior art of Bishop fails to explicitly disclose the UPS and receiving and determining steps performed by the monitoring computer as claimed.

Facchetti teaches a monitoring program adapted to receive a network message including data from the UPS (Page 4 - Running apcupsd - Para. 4), determine an alarm condition of the UPS from the data in the message (Page 4 - Running apcupsd - Para. 4), and determine a computer on the network affected by the alarm condition of the UPS (Page 4 - Running apcupsd - Para. 5-7, Page 5 – Networked Configuration – Para. 1-2, Listings 3-4), wherein the UPS sends a shutdown instruction (Page 4 - Running apcupsd - Para. 4, 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of detecting an alarm condition, a target computer affected by the alarm condition, and sending a predetermined instruction to the affected target computer over the network with the prior art of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing a UPS management software which monitors a locally attached UPS device for alarm conditions, and in the event of an alarm, functions to provide a shutdown function on computers which are all supported by the same UPS (Page 4 - Running apcupsd - Para. 4, 6).

19.   As per claim 22, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as claimed above. Bishop additionally discloses wherein installing the subordinate program from the monitoring computer to the target computer comprises pushing the subordinate program to the target computer via the network (Col. 9 lines 26-51).

20.   As per claim 25, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as
claimed above. Bishop additionally discloses wherein the subordinate program
comprises portable code (Col. 6 lines 61-67).

21.   As per claim 26, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as
claimed above. Bishop additionally discloses wherein the subordinate program has
default configuration parameters that may be reset during installation on the target
computer (Col. 9 lines 33-37 - see configuration parameters reset upon boot).

22.   As per claim 27, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as
claimed above. However, the prior art of Bishop fails to explicitly disclose wherein
monitoring the operational status of the apparatus comprises sending and receiving
messages across a dedicated communication link between the monitoring computer
and the apparatus.

        Facchetti teaches wherein monitoring the operational status of the apparatus
comprises sending and receiving messages across a dedicated communication link
between the monitoring computer and the apparatus (Page 4 - Running apcupsd –
Para. 4-6, Page 5 – Networked Configuration – Para. 1-2, Listings 3-4). It would have
been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made
to incorporate the use of dedicated communication links between the monitoring
computer and the apparatus with the prior art of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have done so for the purpose of implementing a remote master computer for

monitoring the status of the UPS (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 5-6, Page 5 –

Networked Configuration Para. 1-2).

23.   As per claim 28, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, the prior art of Bishop fails to explicitly disclose wherein

monitoring the operational status of the apparatus comprises sending and receiving

messages across the network between the monitoring computer and the apparatus.

        Facchetti teaches wherein monitoring the operational status of the apparatus

comprises sending and receiving messages across the network between the monitoring

computer and the apparatus (Page 4 - Running apcupsd – Para. 4-6, Page 5 –

Networked Configuration – Para. 1-2, Listings 3-4). It would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use

of sending and receiving messages across the network between the monitoring

computer and apparatus with the prior art of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have done so for the purpose of implementing a remote master computer for

monitoring the status of the UPS (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 5-6, Page 5 –

Networked Configuration Para. 1-2).

24.   As per claim 29, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, the prior art of Bishop fails to explicitly disclose generating

from the monitoring program a monitoring computer instruction based on the operational status of the supporting apparatus.

Facchetti teaches generating from the monitoring program a monitoring computer instruction based on the operational status of the supporting apparatus (Page 3 Para. 1, Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 4-7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of generating from the monitoring program a monitoring computer instruction based on the operational status of the supporting apparatus with the prior art of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of detecting a status alert from a UPS and sending the alert to slave computers (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para 4,6).

25.   As per claim 30, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, the prior art of Bishop fails to explicitly disclose wherein the monitoring instruction of claim 29 is a monitoring computer shutdown instruction.

Facchetti teaches wherein the monitoring computer instruction is a monitoring computer shutdown instruction (Page 4 - Running apcupsd - Para. 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a monitoring computer shutdown instruction with the prior art of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of issuing a remote shutdown instruction in the event that a master computer receives an alert from

a UPS in order to ensure data and hardware safety (Page 4 - Running apcupsd - Para.

6).

26.   As per claim 31, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, the prior art of Bishop fails to explicitly disclose wherein

running the subordinate program comprises running the subordinate program in the

background of the target computer.

Facchetti teaches wherein running the subordinate program comprises running

the subordinate program in the background of the target computer (Page 3 Para. 2). It

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate the use of a background subordinate program with the prior art

of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of running

the monitoring as a an operating system service in the background with root privileges

in order to be able to take the actions needed to keep the computer healthy (Page 3

Para. 2).

27.   As per claim 32, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, the prior art of Bishop fails to explicitly disclose wherein

running the subordinate program in the background of the target computer does not

provide a target computer user interface.

Facchetti teaches wherein running the subordinate program in the background of

the target computer does not provide a target computer user interface (Page 3 Para. 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the use of a background daemon monitoring process

with the prior art of Bishop. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the

purpose of running the monitoring as a an operating system service in the background

with root privileges in order to be able to take the actions needed to keep the computer

healthy (Page 3 Para. 2).

28.   As per claim 33, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. Bishop additionally discloses accessing the subordinate program on the

target computer across the network from the monitoring computer (Col. 9 lines 14-25).

29.   As per claim 34, Bishop and Facchetti teach that the second routine comprises

identifying which of a plurality of target computers are affected and which of the plurality

of target computers are unaffected (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 5-7, Page 5 –

Networked Configuration – Para. 1-2, Listing 3-4. It is noted that there is no

requirements that a specified number of target computers are in each category (e.g. one

or more).).

30.   As per claim 35, Bishop and Facchetti teach that the third routine comprises

sending the instructions to the affected target computers and not sending the

instructions to the unaffected target computers (Page 4 – Running apcupsd – Para. 6-7.

The instruction is sent to the affected computers.)

31.   With regard to claims 35-36, the instant claims are substantially similar to claims

33-34, and are rejected for substantially similar reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

32.   Claims 7-8 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bishop and Facchetti in view of *VERITAS WinINSTALL 2000*, hereinafter referred

to as Veritas.

33.   As per claims 7-8, Bishop and Facchetti fail to explicitly disclose wherein

installing the subordinate program from the monitoring computer to the target computer

is done by installing the subordinate program from a floppy diskette or other removable

media, or emailing the subordinate program as a file of executable code from the

monitoring computer to the target computer.

        Veritas teaches installing the subordinate program from a floppy diskette or other

removable media, or emailing the subordinate program as a file of executable code from

the monitoring computer to the target computer (Page 1 Product Highlights (see push,

pull, e-mail, internet/intranet, and CD-ROM distributions), Page 2 Multiple distribution

options). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the use of removable media and e-mail

distribution means with the prior art of Bishop and Facchetti. One of ordinary skill in the

art would have done so for the purpose of supporting a wide range of delivery

mechanisms for ease of use in distribution of software and software updates (Page 2

Multiple distribution options).

34.   As per claims 23-24, Bishop and Facchetti teach the invention substantially as

claimed above. However, Bishop and Facchetti fail to explicitly disclose wherein

installing the subordinate program from the monitoring computer to the target computer

comprises installing the subordinate program by pulling the subordinate program from

the monitoring computer to the target computer via the network, or emailing the

subordinate program as a file of executable code from the monitoring computer to the

target computer.

Veritas teaches installing the subordinate program from the monitoring computer

to the target computer comprises installing the subordinate program by pulling the

subordinate program from the monitoring computer to the target computer via the

network, and emailing the subordinate program as a file of executable code from the

monitoring computer to the target computer (Page 1 Product Highlights (see push, pull,

e-mail, internet/intranet, and CD-ROM distributions), Page 2 Multiple distribution

options). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the use of removable media and e-mail

distribution means with the prior art of Bishop and Facchetti. One of ordinary skill in the

art would have done so for the purpose of supporting a wide range of delivery

mechanisms for ease of use in distribution of software and software updates (Page 2

Multiple distribution options).

Conclusion

35.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Scott Christensen whose telephone number is (571)270-

1144. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30AM -

4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2444

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444